



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Se

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,712	12/12/2001	Vesa Rantanen	460-010741-US(PAR)	5232
2512	7590	03/18/2005	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			BAYERL, RAYMOND J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/017,712	Applicant(s) RANTANEN, VESA	
	Examiner Raymond J. Bayerl	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2173

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "the application area" does not have clear antecedent basis in parent claims 2, 1.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-12, 14 -18, 20, 22 - 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boss et al ("Boss"; U.S. Patent Number 5,758,110).

Concerning independent claim 1, and also comparable independent claims 8, 14, 20, Boss discloses a method for transmitting information from a first terminal to a second terminal, in which method visual information is displayed on a display of the first terminal, wherein in the method at least one area on the display of the first terminal is defined, the information on which area is transmitted to the second terminal provided with at least one display, wherein the visual information received in the second terminal is displayed on said display of the second terminal: The invention provides methods and apparatus for task based application sharing in a graphic user interface such as Windows. A user, referred to as the host user, designates an application to be **shared**, referred to as a shared application. **Another user at a remote location,**

Art Unit: 2173

referred to as the client user, shares control of the shared application. The shared application runs on and executes only on the host system. The client system has a rectangular area on the display screen within which all shared applications are displayed. Further, the client user can see the windows of a shared application and controls the shared application by performing mouse and keyboard movements with the client keyboard and mouse. Because the shared application is running on the host system, all client mouse and keyboard movements are first transmitted to the host system and actually executed on the host system. (col. 2 lines 32-47). Therefore, in Boss, a host and client terminal have a rectangular window, in which information is being jointly displayed on both terminals at the same time.

Regarding claim 2, Boss discloses said area is defined by means of a limiting frame displayed on the display. The client system has a rectangular area on the display screen within which all shared applications are displayed. (col. 39-40) The rectangular area in Boss serves to limit the amount of display that is shared between the host and the client.

Concerning claims 3, 9, 15, 16, 17, Boss states that the location, size and/or the shape of said limiting frame can be changed: In block 320 of FIG. 5a, whenever a window change is detected on the host system, the automatic resizing feature of the present invention is

Art Unit: 2173

initiated. (col. lines 11-14). The rectangular Boss area shares a region with the remote client that does not have to be a particular "application area" (claim 24). Also, in handling the updating of position at the client site, the "limiting frame" can be resized and repositioned "to encompass any region of the display" (claim 25), in keeping with Boss's ability to allow the client user to retain control over the local display.

As per claim 4, Boss discloses the visual information received in the second terminal is displayed on a fixed location of said display of the second terminal: it is possible that windows will remain in a single position.

Concerning claims 5, 10, Boss states the presentation location of the visual information received in the second terminal can be changed in the display of the second terminal: the client user can see the windows of a shared application and controls the shared application by performing mouse and keyboard movements with the client keyboard and mouse. (col. 2 lines 41-47). The client user in Boss has control over the windows appearing in the display remote from the host, and can thus reposition to suit the needs of the client's desktop.

Regarding claims 6, 11 Boss discloses information related to the location of the area defined on the display of the first terminal is transmitted to the second terminal, wherein the visual information transmitted from the defined area is displayed on a substantially corresponding location on said display of the second terminal: FIG. 8 illustrates the detection of covered portions feature of the present invention. On host system 14, a shared task application

Art Unit: 2173

1 (app 1) is partially covered by a non-shared task application 3 (app 3). The lower right corner of application 1 covered by non-shared task application 3 may contain data. ... When application 1 or application 3 is moved, or application 1 is brought to the top of the display screen of host system 14, the hatching on client system 11 is removed and the previously hatched data is updated. (col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 3). The changes occurring at the host site are transmitted so as to affect the display region presented for the shared information on the client.

As per claims 7, 12, 18, Boss states that the information display of the first terminal is transmitted at intervals, wherein the visual information is updated at intervals on the display of the second terminal, since periodic packet transmissions must be made from host to client in order to maintain a properly updated version of the shared screen.

As in claim 22 (and also claim 23), where “the at least one area is a portion of the application area of the display randomly selected by the user”, the Boss client user can perform random repositionings.

4. Claims 13, 19, 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boss in view of Hawkins et al (“Hawkins”; U.S. Patent Number 6,343,318).

Boss shows a method and apparatus for sharing applications via a graphical user interface over a communication network. The apparatus display a rectangular area on the host machine and allows any client machine to view operations only in the

Art Unit: 2173

rectangular area. The client also has functional capabilities in rectangular area parallel to the host machine, and is able to operate other functions outside the rectangular area. But while Boss discloses the two terminals being connected over a communication network, which allows packets to be sent between the host and client (col. 2 lines 32-47) & (col. 5 line 64-col 6 line10) & (col. 6 lines 35-42), Boss does not show the host or client having a wireless communication device.

Hawkins et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,343,318) shows a host machine communicating to a client machine over a wireless network. The wireless client receives information from the host machine and displays information to screen.

Specifically as per claims 13, 19, 21, Hawkins discloses that at least one terminal is a wireless communication device: FIG. 4 shows a wireless network topology 400 used for some embodiments of the invention. The main components of the wireless communications system are the wireless client 405, the wireless network access point 410, the tunneler 430, the proxy server 180, and the Internet 190. The wireless network access point 410 has a corresponding wireless network access point radio 420.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use a host terminal communicating to a wireless client terminal to display information, from a rectangular area on a host machine, to the screen.

The modifications would have been obvious because it was a known desirability to use a handheld device to access information; thus, the person having ordinary skill would have looked ^{to} communication networks that have the ability to transmit communication packets between wireless terminals such as Hawkins.

RB

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8 November 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (remarks, page 7) that because "In Boss, the host designates an 'application to be shared'", a distinction occurs with respect to the presently claimed invention, where "the user can define or randomly select an area on the display, and the information within that defined area is transmitted to the other party". However, it remains that an "area" is defined by the host user in Boss on a "first terminal", and the image contents of this "area" then are transmitted for appearance in a similar client device region. This reads in an anticipating way upon applicant's claims, as indicated above. It does not matter that application processes happen to be taking place in the shared region; as much could readily be occurring in applicant's own "area".

Applicant then argues (page 8) that "In the system of Boss, it is not possible to define an area on the display at random and to transmit this area (or information inside this area) to another party." However, it remains that Boss discloses a windowing environment in which a window enclosing an area may be moved, resized, re-shaped in the style of an ordinary window, but with the effects being transmitted forward to the client. Because the contents of such a controllable window are also seen in the client,

RB

Art Unit: 2173

this anticipates applicant's invention in which windows may be randomly placed yet reproduce information on a "second terminal".

Answering applicant's assertion at page 9, and concerning claim 2: "all that Boss discloses is that all shared applications are displayed in the rectangular area" and "There is nothing 'limiting' about this.", it remains that a constrained region contains the area that is copied between the host and client in Boss, and this is a "limiting frame".

Applicant also notes, concerning claim 3, that "FIG. 5a merely relates to a 'window change' and that a window counting procedure to keep track", and therefore "Boss does not disclose or suggest that the location, size and/or shape of the limiting frame can be changed". However, and as has been noted above, the windowing set-up of Boss permits arbitrary inputs of window operations such as this to the one that encloses the shared region. This line of reasoning also applies to applicant's page 10 comment concerning claim 5's "presentation location" variation.

Concerning the Section 103 rejection based upon Boss and Hawkins, applicant argues at page ¹⁰~~9~~ that "Hawkins does not provide for defining any area within the whole range of the display and the ability to transmit information within that area to the second party". However, this is the Examiner's reason for relying upon Boss, who does teach this function in sharing the region between host and client, with windowing operations being also transmitted along with the shared information. RB

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The additionally-cited US Patent documents on the attached form PTO-892 relate to applicant's problem of sharing a display area between two networked computers.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl whose telephone number is (571) 272-4045. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Th from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM ET.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (571) 272-4048. All patent application

Art Unit: 2173

related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (703) 872-9306.

10. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

15 March 2005